The Review.

Vol. X. St. Louis, Mo., May 28, 1903. No. 21.

STUDIES IN AMERICAN FREEMASONRY.

1. Introductory Remarks.

"Why does the Catholic Church forbid her children to become Masons?" is a question daily put us. "Why are Catholics cut off from the benefits that affiliation with such an organization would bring them? There is no harm in Masonry. It is a mere social and benevolent institution. It admits all religions in a spirit of universal tolerance. No atheist can be a member. It teaches brotherly love and universal benevolence. It requires a man to be moral; enforces respect for authority; assists its associates in life, and when death calls them to a glorious immortality, consigns dust to dust with appropriate ceremonies and provides with tender and solicitous care for the widow and the orphan. Why then does the Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church alone among all the religions of the world, stand forth uncompromisingly and say to her children:—'If you wish to embrace Masonry, you must choose between Masonry and me; to belong to both, to be true to both, you can not.' Is this fair? Is this just? Is it even politic to provoke a quarrel when harmony is to the interests of everybody concerned? Why not rather join hands with Masonry for the upbuilding of humanity, that all the forces of good may be united in a common cause, instead of being disunited and antagonistic as they now are?"

In words seemingly so fair and dispassionate is the cause of Masonry pleaded and the fault of opposition charged against the Catholic Church. The innocence of Masonry is assumed as a fact beyond dispute, and the whole difficulty consists in discovering the Church's motives for acting as she does. Some find a ready solution in the Church's ignorance of the inner nature of Masonry; for, they argue, as Masons are oath-bound not to reveal their secrets, and as these secrets are imparted by word of

mouth, what can the Church know about them? Others less friendly to the Church, attribute the condemnation of her pontiffs to bigotry and prejudice; to priestly tyranny and pettiness, which would enslave minds and fetter the just liberties of our race.

Ignorance, bigotry, prejudice, priestcraft are, outside the Church, the commonly accepted theories of an opposition to Masonry as firm as it is unvarying. We readily grant that if there be nothing wrong in Masonry, it is hard to give a reasonable explanation of the Church's action; that if Masonry be a mere social and benevolent organization, moral in its character, though prescinding from any definite religious form or established dogma, a society established merely for mutual material aid and assistance, as so many other societies around us are established, the Church's discrimination in the matter of Masonry is harsh, to say the least.

But here precisely is a point for careful investigation. IS THERE NOTHING WRONG IN MASONRY? And when we say nothing WRONG, we mean from a Catholic standpoint, for it is from this standpoint that the Church must judge. We are seeking for a reason of the Church's condemnation. If Masonry fosters in its bosom anything un-Christian or anti-Catholic, the reason is evident. The Church must, in such circumstances, forbid her children to join the organization, no matter what temporal advantages they might otherwise reap from it. Her opposition, moreover, in that case, is not to be laid at her door as if she were in fault; it is based upon the very nature of things. It is not ignorance, it is not prejudice, it is not bigotry, it is not priestcraft; it is the impossibility of reconciling the Christian and the un-Christian, the Catholic and the anti-Catholic, that calls forth her condemnation.

Masonry will have been found to be something quite different from what it pretends to be, namely a social organization that has no direct bearing upon religion, and as an un-Christian, anti-Catholic society, it will be condemned. It will not be mere benevolence, as the world at large understands the term; it will not be the mere material care of the widow and the orphan; it will be something quite different, with a different end in view, artfully concealed though it may be under the borrowed cloak of charity.

Is Masonry in its origin, its nature, its tendencies, its principles, its aims, such that from a Christian and Catholic standpoint the Church can approve it, or at least passively permit that her children embrace it?—these are the questions that shall occupy us in the following papers, and we hope that when we shall have finished, we shall have given to candid minds outside the Church and wavering minds within, a sufficient answer to the

question: "Why does not the Catholic Church allow her members to become Masons?" Neither will others, we are confident, those namely for whom the Church's word is enough, peruse these papers without profit, for it is desirable that Catholics may not only be able to defend the Church and her decisions by those general arguments that establish her authority in matters of faith and morals, but that they may also have at hand some of the reasons which, in special matters, guide her or force her to action.

And, first of all, allow us to remark that, in order to be good, it is not sufficient for Masonry to have some good or seemingly good points in it. There is nothing so absolutely bad that there is not in it, at least apparently, some good; for even the spirit of darkness comes to us under the appearance of an angel of light. To be good and desirable and deserving of approval, all moral evil must be absent; since it is only then that a human individual or a human organization can be styled good. No one will say that he who treats his wife and children kindly, is charitable to his neighbors and generous to his friends, is a good man, a desirable companion, if he be at the same time an embezzler, a drunkard, a blasphemer, a murderer. One act of robbery will send him to jail, one act of murder will deprive him of his life. He is a bad man despite his many virtues. The same rule holds good of human societies, for they are aggregations of men and subject to the same laws of human nature. It is not enough that this or that be good in them; there must also be the absence of all moral evil. If in anything Masonry errs, therefore, the Church must condemn it, so long as that point remains uncorrected; she must forbid her children to join it regardless of temporal consequences to herself or to them. In condemning it, she does not condemn what is good or what appears to be good, but what is evil. She approves and blesses what is good, but she wishes that the good should part company with the evil, should be woed for its own sake, and not by its companionship help to render evil less hideous.

We do not purpose to write an exhaustive treatise, to follow Masonry through all the devious windings of its system—this for our present purpose will be found absolutely needless. All that we are called upon to do is to show that there are in Masonry things that are directly antagonistic to the Catholic Church, things that no Catholic can admit and practise without formal apostasy from the Catholic faith. We shall need a good guide in our investigations, one who knows whereof he speaks, and on the truthfulness of whose word we can depend. We want a guide that will inform us about American Masonry, an American guide, lest we be told that what we say may be true of European Masonry,

but that it has no place among ourselves. Certain and personal knowledge, candid truthfulness concerning American Masonry, its practices and principles—these we seek and with these alone shall we be satisfied. Fortunately what we seek is at hand—an author thoroughly conversant with his matter, speaking not for the world at large but for the private instruction of the American Mason in his lodge. He will assure us in his preface that we can trust him, as his book is a compendium of others already received and approved, as he tells us, by an indulgent brotherhood.

The title page will introduce us to the work and its author:

Mackey's
Masonic Ritualist:
or,
Monitorial Instructions
In the Degrees from
Entered Apprentice to Select Master
by
A. G. Mackey, M. D.,
Past General Grand High Priest of the General Grant Chapter of the United States, Author of a "Lexicon of True Masonry," "Manual of the Lodge," "The Book of the Chapter," "Cryptic Masonry,"
etc.
New York:
Clark and Maynard, Publishers.

Its preface is self-explanatory:

"The greater part of this work," says our author, "is not new. It is composed of the 'Manual of the Lodge' and the 'Book of the Chapter' which have already been submitted to the ordeal of criticism, and received, I believe, a favorable judgment. To these I have added a similar manual on the degrees of the council, so that the present book embraces in its monitorial instructions *all that can lawfully be taught in print* of the degrees of the American Rite.

"I can have nothing, therefore, to say of its contents that I have not already said when the original books went to press. I have not added or omitted a line. All that is in the larger works is here, and nothing is here that is not in them. But these works are, by their greater size and larger type appropriated to the study; this by its portable form, recommends itself as a companion to the Masonic student in his journeys from home, or in momentary relaxation from his daily vocation, when an hour or a part of an hour may be profitably devoted to the refreshment of his memory, or to the investigation of some point which may have just suggested itself to him in the exoteric ritual of the Order.

"It is therefore as a *vademecum*, a book to be carried about by the Mason as a constant companion ready to be referred to at any

moment, and as ready to be returned to the pocket as soon as the reference has been made, that it presents its claim to the patronage of the fraternity.

"I have been told by some of my friends that such a form for the ritualistic works that I had already printed was needed, and that the book would be acceptable to the Masonic public. I have followed their suggestions. Time will show whether they have been mistaken or not. For myself, of course, I hope and am rather inclined to think that the experiment will be successful. The favorable reception already given to my labors by an indulgent brotherhood, saves me from despondency. To that brotherhood the 'Ritualist' is most fraternally submitted.–A. G. Mackey." (pp. 3, 4, 5).

Our author kindly at the very outset satisfies our minds on most important points.

We can trust his *knowledge*, for besides having filled some of the highest positions in the Order, he is one of the most prolific of the standard authors on Masonic matters.*)

We can trust his *truthfulness*, for he is not writing for the profane world at large but for the instruction of the Masonic body. His book is to be the Mason's companion, the explainer of difficulties, the solver of doubts.

We can trust his *accuracy*, for his book is a compilation of others which have stood the test of the brotherhood's criticism.

We shall therefore take the Ritualist as our *vademecum*, our companion, thanking it when it will speak its mind openly and freely, and seeking by a collation of passages to understand its meaning when it is purposely obscure. With its valuable assistance we hope to successfully overcome the difficulties that beset our path. Our readers must, however, have patience with us and not expect us to prove everything at once or attack everything at once. Order will require that we take up one thing after another, and clearness will demand that we go slowly. To judge a case fairly, one must wait until all the proofs are in; earlier arguments that may appear incomplete receive the fulness of their evidence from those that are adduced later. All that we ask of the fair-minded reader is that he peruse our argument in full, and we have no doubt, in the light of the proofs that we shall adduce, but that he will candidly admit that the Church is more than justified in her condemnation of Masonry.

---

*) Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography (iv, 135) says of A. G. Mackey's works on Masonry that they 'are considered authoritative," and Allibone's Critical Dictionary of English and American authors (II. 1179) refers to his Treatise on the Laws, Usages, and Landmarks of Freemasonry as "the most important Masonic Book of the age," which "is to Freemasonry what the mariner's compass is to navigation."

"THE DEVIL IN ROBES."

AN INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.

I.

[From the Editor of THE REVIEW to the Postmaster General.]

St. Louis, Mo., March 16th, 1903.

HON. POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:—Some months ago Postmaster Baumhoff promised me to investigate a complaint made by myself and several other Catholic editors regarding the transmission through the mails, from here, of a scurrilous and indecent pamphlet entitled 'The Devil in Robes' and directed against the Catholic clergy. The Rev. editor of the *St. Joseph's Blatt* at Mt. Angel, Ore., just informs me that this pamphlet is still going through the mails. Permit me to ask you if any investigation of the matter has been made and to what results it has led.

Thanking you in advance for the courtesy of a reply, I am,

Very respectfully yours

ARTHUR PREUSS,
Editor and Publisher THE REVIEW.

II.

[From the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General to the Editor of THE REVIEW.]

Mr. Arthur Preuss, Washington, March 19, 1903.
Editor and Pub. THE REVIEW,
St. Louis, Mo.

Sir:—I return your letter in reference to the advertising circulars entitled "The Devil in Robes" sent out by the Continental Bible House of Saint Louis, and have to advise you that about a year ago this matter was brought to the attention of His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, and he concurred in the opinion of this Department that to take any action toward excluding the circular from the mails would be to give the publication further advertisement and increased sales. For that reason it is not thought expedient to take such action.

Very respectfully,

J. J. HOWLEY,
Acting First Assistant Postmaster General.

III.

[From Cardinal Gibbons to the *Church Progress*.]

Baltimore, Md., April 3rd, 1903.

Editor The *Church Progress*:

Dear Sir:—In reply to your letter asking information about the action of His Eminence in the "Devil in Robes" publication,

His Eminence directs me to say that he has no recollection at all of ever having had any communication with the Postoffice authorities about it. Very truly yours,

P. C. GAVAN, Chancellor.

IV.

[From the Editor of THE REVIEW to the Postmaster General.]

St. Louis, Mo., April 11th, 1903.

HON. POSTMASTER GENERAL,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir :—You will recollect that I wrote to you on March 16th in reference to 'The Devil in Robes.' Enclosure No. 1 contains my letter and your reply through Mr. Howley. The *Church Progress* of this city now prints a note from Cardinal Gibbons' secretary (enclosure No. 2), stating that His Eminence has absolutely no recollection of ever having had any communication with the Post Office authorities in regard to this matter.

In justice to yourself and the Cardinal, and for the information of several million Catholics who are deeply interested in this affair, will you please give me your authority for the statement made in your previous letter per Mr. Howley?

Very respectfully yours,

ARTHUR PREUSS,
Editor and Publisher THE REVIEW.

V.

[From the Editor of THE REVIEW to the Postmaster General.]

St. Louis, Mo., May 6th, 1903.

TO THE HON. POSTMASTER GENERAL :

On the 11th ult. I wrote to you with regard to 'The Devil in Robes' and the transmission of the filthy advertising circulars of the Continental Bible House of St. Louis through the U. S. mails. In a previous letter to me you gave as the reason for your non-interference your conviction, based upon an alleged consultation with His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, that to forbid the transmission of those circulars through the mails would result only in advertising and spreading the book still more widely. I sent you a printed copy of the Cardinal's declaration that he had *absolutely no recollection of having been consulted by the Post Office authorities in this matter.* All these statements having been published in the Catholic press, the Postmaster General stands before the Catholic public of the land as a man who, when hard pressed, makes assertions which he can not substantiate. Permit me to suggest that it is decidedly in your own interest and that of the Administration that you clear up this matter by a positive statement which

I shall be glad to make known to the Catholic press and public through the columns of THE REVIEW.

Very respectfully yours,

ARTHUR PREUSS,
Editor and Publisher THE REVIEW.

VI.

[From the First Assistant Postmaster General to the Editor of THE REVIEW.]

Washington, May 14th, 1903.

Mr. Arthur Preuss,
Editor and Publisher THE REVIEW,
St. Louis, Mo.

Sir:—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 6th.

Under date of July 26th, 1901, Rev. Louis O'Donovan, "in the name of Cardinal Gibbons and as Chancellor" forwarded a circular entitled "The Devil in Robes" to the Post Office Department. Upon receipt of the circular, and in reply to His Eminence, under date of July 29th, 1901, the Department wrote to the Chancellor as follows:

".....It has occurred to me that in view of the fact that it is a question whether there has been any violation of law.....the better course to pursue would be to ignore the circular, as an unsuccessful attempt to punish the party mailing it would give the book the notoriety and advertisement which the publisher would like to have.

"However, I will be pleased to have your views in the matter, and if you think it would be well to take action, the case will be submitted to the United States Attorney. Kindly favor me with your views."

To this letter the following reply was made:

"Secretary's Office,
Cardinal's Residence,
408 N. Charles St.,
Baltimore, Md.

Mr. J. M. Masten,
Acting First Assistant Postmaster General,

Dear Sir:—In reply to your esteemed reply of July 29th, in the name of Cardinal Gibbons, I beg to thank you for your prompt and kind attention. After consideration your suggestion to ignore the obnoxious circular and thus avoid giving it notoriety seems wise, and we gladly would adopt the same as you suggest.

Again thanking you, I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully,

July 30th, 1901. (Signed) LOUIS O'DONOVAN."

I send you this correspondence so that you may make it part of the printed record of the case if you feel inclined to further pursue the matter.

Very respectfully,

R. J. WYNNE,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

"DER WAHRE JACOB."

A unique feature of market days in Germany, particularly of village market days, used to be the "wahre Jacob," a peddler dressed in fantastic clothes, auctioneering his wares; but not in the way of other auctioneers, waiting for higher bids beginning with the lowest; the "wahre Jacob" started at the highest, swearing that the article was worth more than twice what he asked, and when no one wanted it he came down gradually in price until he found a simpleton who believed he could strike a bargain, while in reality he was fleeced. Thus the "wahre Jacob" —the true Jacob—got his name not from his telling the truth, but from the contrary. Of late years this "true Jacob" had disappeared in Germany, no one could tell whither; now it appears he has turned up in New York, opened a camp near the editorial sanctum of the *Independent*, and beguiled its editor into buying his goods. He calls himself "Presbyter" and makes the *Independent* (No. 2833) believe that he is "a Roman Catholic of scholarship and distinction and in unimpeachable standing in his Church." The "wahre Jacob" always is in good standing, he would be foolish if he were not. His *pièce de resistance*, which the editor of the *Independent* could not resist buying, was the "Roman Curia," in the shape of a "goat," "poised in mid-air upon the four sticks of Canon Law, scholasticism, avarice and greed," and a few others, notably the "religious orders"—"a strong prop but not an essential one. The Catholic nations of Europe have demonstrated it beyond cavil. The older of them have given their names only to various kinds of beers and drinks, Augustiner-brau (!), Dominikaner-brau (!), Franciskaner-brau (!), Kloster-brau (!), Chartreuse, Benedictine.....And as for the Jesuits, they have added to the lexicons of modern tongues the synonym of every deviltry in the word Jesuitism."

What the Editor of the *Independent* had heard of the article so far was worth a dollar a line. But like a wise man he waited till the "wahre Jacob" should either come down in price or throw something into the bargain. The "wahre Jacob" chose the latter. Such a goat, standing in mid-air on four sticks, with side-props that are of no avail, is a menace to every body—Christian, Jew, and Hottentot. What is to be done? The "wahre Jacob" lets the anxious editor into the secret. That goat, although *standing* on four sticks, "will in the long *run* come into agreement with the thought and movements of our day. But it will do so only by means of forces and tendencies at work outside her pale". (How lucky it is paled in!) "Perhaps the greatest will prove to be the American Republic, whose constitution was the first to declare

the total separation of Church and State. The Americanization of the world spells the Americanization of the Church."

Spellbound by such prospects, the editor at once "coughed up" two tens and a five and rushed into print with the good news, forgetting, however, that the "wahre Jacob" had tied a little string to his glorious prophecy by saying it would not come true in our day; but come true it must or "Presbyter" Jacob will lose his precious reputation of being "der wahre Jacob."

ST. DOMINIC AND THE ROSARY.

In No. 48 (page 765) of the last and in No. 1 of the current volume of THE REVIEW, we adverted to a number of rather sensational theses defended by Rev. P. Heribert Holzapfel, O. F. M., in the University of Munich. One of them was: "*Rosarium a S. Dominico neque institutum neque propagatum est*," i. e., the Rosary has neither been established nor propagated by St. Dominic. His defense of this thesis is now published by P. Holzapfel, in a separate pamphlet, under the title, 'St. Dominic und der Rosenkranz,' in the *Veröffentlichungen aus dem kirchenhistorischen Seminar*, No. 12. (Munich: Lentner, 1903. 43 pp.) We intend to review it more at length in a later issue and for the present only note the main conclusions of the reverend author. P. Holzapfel shows that the received opinion concerning the Rosary is altogether untenable, but that much remains to be done before an exhaustive history of this devotion can be written. It is certain that the Rosary, like every other popular devotion, has developed gradually. In some form or other it may have been prayed already in the first millennium of the Christian era. But we have no reliable records dating back further than the twelfth century. From the twelfth to the fifteenth century we know of but few who cultivated this devotion, until the Dominican Alanus a Rupe or Alan de la Roche undertook to propagate it with great energy and enthusiasm. A hundred years later the Rosary, chiefly through the efforts of the Dominicans, had become a truly popular devotion. It is only in consequence of the faith with which certain alleged visions and fables of Alan de la Roche*) were widely received, that the name of St. Dominic became so intimately connected with this devotion.

*) "The authenticity of the visions and writings of Alanus a Rupe (de la Roche)," says the Kirchenlexikon (X. 1278), "has met with much doubt" (Cfr. AA. SS. Boll., Aug. I, 364 sqq.)

THE ANTI-STRIKE LAWS AND THE RECENT SOCIAL CRISIS IN HOLLAND.

An American priest of Dutch birth writes THE REVIEW:

There have appeared of late in the press many erroneous statements regarding the so-called anti-strike laws of Holland.

Some secular newspapers have editorially commented on these laws as if they were a capitalistic conspiracy against labor. The Catholic *New World*, misled by the inaccurate comments of the daily press, said in its No. 32: "Holland certainly occupies a unique position as a country where a man can not quit a government job, once he accepts it."

Here is the whole law in a nutshell. Punishable is: 1st. Unlawful intimidation by employer or employé; 2d. Violation of contract.

The first provision is certainly no encroachment upon labor. England, since 1874, has a similar law, and it is even severer than the Dutch. Yet, there is perhaps not a country in the world where labor unions are in a more flourishing and prosperous condition than in Great Britain.

The second provision of the new law, like the first, applies to both employers and employés.

A violation of a just and equitable contract conflicts with the natural law. The State has the duty to sanction and enforce such contracts. "Laws should lend their influence and authority to the removal of the causes which lead to conflicts between the masters and those whom they employ." (Leo XIII., De Conditione Opificum). Is violation of a contract not very often the cause of these lamentable conflicts?

The present government of the Netherlands follows in social questions very closely the principles laid down by Leo XIII. in the above quoted encyclical. The platforms of the anti-revolutionary (Protestant) and the Catholic parties are in this respect almost identical with the principles contained in the papal letter. Now, think of it, a Christian Democratic government waging war upon the organization of labor unions, as the editor of the Milwaukee *Sentinel* editorially proclaimed a few weeks ago. Think of it, a Christian Democratic government violating the rights of the laboring men and disregarding the primary principles of sociology.

But what if a contract between employer and employé would be really unjust or appear to be so to either of the parties concerned?

If either employers or employés have real or apparent grievances, they can bring them before an impartial arbitration com-

mittee, that will decide after due investigation. This arbitration is, however, not compulsory.

It is evident, therefore, that the Dutch anti-strike laws are neither radical nor unjust. Strikes are not made impossible, whether the laboring men be employed by the government or by private employers. Unlawful intimidation is forbidden, in order to protect capital and labor. Violation of contract is forbidden for the same reason, but after the expiration of his contract any workman can quit his job.

The editors of the daily papers may freely assert that the Dutch anti-strike laws would not find sympathy in a country "where liberal views prevail;" but such an assertion can only be the outcome of gross ignorance of the real nature and end of the laws about which they hold airy discussions, at the same time drawing unwarranted conclusions, by which they would fain indicate that labor can not be so well protected in a monarchy as in a republic.

In my opinion the monarchical or the republican form of government has little to do with the social question, and laws similar to those recently enacted in Holland might likewise have favorable effects in our country of strikes and boycotts.

* * *

The united activity of Catholics and Protestants has averted a violent revolution in Holland. This fact, which cannot be denied, makes me ask: When will there begin an organized Christian Democratic movement in the U. S? There is some truth in the assertion that Catholics and Christians generally should remain members of the labor unions to oppose the Socialists and to prevent them from dominating these organizations. Many Catholics and Protestants of Holland defended the same opinion some years ago. They endeavored to "convert" the Socialists, with the result that the Socialists made more converts among the missionaries than the latter among the Socialists. Fine promises of shorter hours and higher wages appealed very strongly to the ordinary minds of the sons of toil. At last Catholics and Protestants began to realize that they had to organize labor unions based on Christian principles in order to save the people from the dangers of Socialism. But Catholics and Protestants can form a Christian Democratic league without leaving the ordinary labor unions. Catholics thus organized and instructed on the principles governing the solution of social problems, would be able to oppose Socialism in the labor unions.

What would happen in this country, where there are no Christian labor organizations, if there ever would arise a crisis similar to that in Holland? On such occasions workmen are inclined to

listen to the most radical reformers. As was the case in Holland, the more moderate Troelstra, notwithstanding his superior ability as a leader, was overcome by the revolutionary Domela Nieuwenhuis.

Of American Socialism Father J. A. Ryan writes: "Owing to the atheistic character of many of its leaders, and the kind of literature that it disseminates and produces, the American (Socialistic) movement seems to be largely if not predominantly anti-Christian." (*Catholic Review of Pedagogy*, vol. I., p. 361.

It seems, then, imperative that American Catholics disseminate and produce Christian social literature, not so much to check the Socialistic movement as to move Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, to social activity. Social action must be our motto. Nothing will more effectively oppose the obnoxious tendencies of an anti-Christian or atheistic Socialism. And since social knowledge is absolutely necessary for social action, the dissemination of Christian social literature and the organization of a Christian Democratic movement seems to be an imperative duty imposed by the conditions of the time upon American Catholics and all those who glory in the Christian name.

"Every one must put his hand to the work which falls to his share, and that at once and immediately, lest the evil, which is already so great, may by delay grow absolutely beyond remedy. Those who rule the State must use the law and the institutions of the country; masters and rich men must remember their duty; the poor, whose interests are at stake, must make every lawful and proper effort; and since religion alone can destroy the evil at its root, all men must be persuaded that the primary need is to return to real Christianity, in the absence of which all the plans and devices of the wisest will be of little avail." (Leo XIII.)

A NEW HISTORY OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

There has just begun to appear the most extensive history, or rather collection of sources for the history, of the Philippines ever attempted in any language: The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803: Explorations by early navigators, descriptions of the islands and their peoples, their history, and records of Catholic missions, as related in contemporaneous books and manuscripts, etc. Translated from the originals. Edited and annotated by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, with historical introduction and additional notes by Edward Gaylord Bourne. With maps, portraits, etc. Cleveland, O.: The Arthur H. Clark Company. This monumental work is to comprise no less than

fifty-five volumes, of which the first two (volume I., 1493-1529; volume II., 1521-1569) are now ready. The series will end with the year 1803 and aims to include only documents not otherwise easily accessible.

Professor Bourne's introduction occupies seventy pages; within those limits he gives us what even the severe critic of the N. Y. *Evening Post* and of the *Nation* admits to be "the best considered essay on the Philippine history ever published in English." One is especially impressed with his plea for fairness toward the record of Spanish colonialism. Results speak for themselves, and the fact is that Catholic Spain has left a far more benevolent colonizing record than Protestant England. His extensive reading in Philippine history has led Professor Bourne to side with the traditional view of the islanders at the time of the conquest, as a set of a savages, whose descendants owe almost everything to their monastic preceptors. He delares that the Spanish conquerors "preserved the essential features" of the Filipinos' social organization, and that they introduced village life. His estimate of the accomplishments of the religous orders in the heroic period of missionary labors, the "Golden Age," as he calls it, is eminently fair. He charges the decline from thenceforward on the retrogressive economic policy of the Spanish government, on its system of trade monopolies, its inept governors, and corrupt provincial administrators, and says that, nevertheless, "a corrupt civil service and a futile and decrepit commercial system were, through the friars' efforts, rendered relatively harmless, because circumscribed in their effects."

OF THE "KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS."

The quasi-approbation given recently by the Archbishop of Dubuque to the "Knights of Columbus," elicits some noteworthy remarks from the "official organ of the Archdiocese of Baltimore," the *Catholic Mirror*, which has always been very friendly to the order.

"There are those in this country,"—says our contemporary (No. 19)—"loyal and zealous Catholics, who look askance at the Knights of Columbus and fear for the Catholicism of the order in consequence of manifestation of a certain trend, regarded as too liberal to be safely Catholic. The incident at Belleville, when the injunction of the Bishop was disregarded by the organizing official of the order, is recent enough to linger in remembrance, and it is not recalled that the supreme officials of the order took step to disclaim the acts of their subordinate."

This is a refreshing admission, not only of a serious mistake

made by the "Knights of Columbus," but also of the fact, hitherto frequently and violently denied, that a man may be a "loyal and zealous Catholic" without hailing in this new order the *non plus ultra* of perfection.

If the *Mirror* adds that "the Masonic-like ritual" of the order, so "repugnant to some," is "a matter of minor import," it makes light of a very serious and uncanny thing, which evidently rests like an incubus upon its soul, since it adds the expression of a hope, which we heartily share, that "the order will some day revise its liturgy."

As for those "thousands of doubting Catholics" who hesitate to approve the Knights of Columbus, we fear it will take more than a laudatory utterance from Archbishop Keane to dispel their conscientious and well-founded doubts and apprehensions on a subject of such grave import to the welfare of the Catholic body in this lodge-ridden and liberalistic country.

The N. Y. *Sun* of May 17th, 1903, contains a two-column article relating to Mr. Henry Austin Adams, formerly a Protestant Episcopalian minister, who since his reception into the Church has attained some prominence as a lecturer, speaker, and writer in the Catholic cause. The appearance of the same matter "with illustrations" in another paper (N. Y. *Herald*) on the same day shows that the story, which reads sadly enough, has been exploited by the two newspapers as a choice bit of sensation with which to regale their Sunday readers. Of the facts in the case we know nothing, and, for the present at least, both prudence and charity dictate that we should forbear expressing any opinion. But we are startled to read in the *Sun's* narrative that the letter from Mr. Adams—the groundwork of the whole article—was "received by an archbishop" (not named). Assuming that it was not purloined, how came such a letter to pass from the possession of "an archbishop" into the offices of the newspapers? The sensationalism of the whole performance, the resulting scandal to the name of religion, and the manifest effort to "work the press" for some purpose not yet clearly to be seen, compel us to disbelieve that any archbishop could have been so indiscreet as to permit the publication of such a letter for any purpose.

We are thankful to the V. Rev. F. V. Nugent, C. M., Rector of Kenrick Seminary, for calling our attention to two misstatements contained in the article "Clerics at the Bat" in No. 19 of THE REVIEW, for which the material was taken, with due credit to the sources, from the Chicago *Tribune* and the *Catholic Union and Times* of Buffalo. 1. The game of baseball referred to was not, as asserted by the *Catholic Union and Times*, between the faculty and students of St. Vincent's College, Chicago, but between the students of the College and young priests of the city of Chicago.

2. St. Vincent's College is *not*, as one might be led to suppose from the wording of the *Tribune's* report and our own concluding remark, based thereon, a seminary, but an ordinary day-school college.

According to the *Public Ledger* (May 2nd), "Bishop" Frederick Burgess (Episcopalian), of Long Island, has caused considerable perturbation among Episcopalians of his diocese by placing a ban upon the playing of euchre for prizes at church functions. The raising of money by this means for the church had become quite popular in Brooklyn and other Long Island cities. The "Bishop" thinks harm is done thereby to the morals of the people, and that money obtained by fostering the gambling instinct in young parishioners is something which every rector should refuse. His clergy are heartily supporting him in this matter, though some of them had given tacit approval to the prize euchres.

We have received several newspaper clippings containing a New York despatch in which it is stated that three Catholic priests had been initiated into the "Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks."

At New Orleans, according to the *Daily Picayune* of May 16th, the Elks were permitted to erect a booth at a Catholic church fair, and one evening was devoted to them as "Elks' night" with a program of their own making.

Those of our readers who know who and what the "Elks" are, will be inclined to ask with deep sorrow: Whither are we drifting?

We read in the *Western Watchman* (No. 27): "The enemies of the Catholic University are delighted that the Holy Father has admitted in an interview with Msgr. O'Connell that the institution has not come up to his expectations. It might not rejoice them to learn that the Pope knows who the enemies of the University are, and told its new rector to avoid an encounter, if possible; but if not, to walk over them."

Msgr. O'Connell was in St. Louis week before last. Are we to take this blast of the *Western Watchman* for his reply to the peace suggestions made by certain well-meaning Catholic papers?

Present methods and future prospects of insurance societies in general, and assessment or fraternal societies in particular, are being scientifically treated from week to week by THE REVIEW of St. Louis. Students of this live question will find Mr. Preuss' able little paper well worthy of perusal.—*Catholic Union and Times*, No. 5.

There is a splendid opening for a good Catholic physician at Shawneetown, Ill. Apply to the pastor, Rev. F. Beuckmann.